

BEFORE THE VIRGINIA BOARD OF MEDICINE

IN RE: LEILA KUMP, M.D., REINSTATEMENT APPLICANT
License Number: 0101-243155
Suspension Date: October 18, 2013
Case Number: 216052

ORDER

JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 2.2-4020, 2.2-4024(F), and 54.1-2400(11), a panel of the Virginia Board of Medicine (“Board”) held a formal administrative hearing on February 17, 2022, in Henrico County, Virginia, to receive and act upon Leila Kump’s application for reinstatement of her license to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Virginia and to inquire into evidence that grounds exist to deny said application.

Leila Kump, M.D., appeared at this proceeding and was not represented by legal counsel.

Upon consideration of the evidence, the Board adopts the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and issues the Order contained herein.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Leila Kump, M.D. was issued License Number 0101-243155 to practice medicine on February 29, 2008. By Order of the Department of Health Professions entered October 18, 2013, said license was mandatorily suspended.

2. Dr. Kump’s licenses to practice medicine were restricted in other jurisdictions, as set forth below:

a. By Consent Order dated January 16, 2015, the Maryland State Board of Physicians (“Maryland Board”) revoked Dr. Kump’s medical license for a minimum period of one year. This action was based on findings that from December 2013 through March 2014, Dr. Kump represented

herself to the public as a person authorized to practice medicine, which was a violation of the Maryland Board's Final Decision and Order dated September 20, 2013, suspending her medical license.

b. By Final Decision and Order dated April 29, 2015, the District of Columbia Board of Medicine accepted Dr. Kump's surrender for revocation of her license to practice medicine.

c. By Order of Reinstatement dated June 3, 2016, the Maryland Board placed Dr. Kump on probation for a minimum period of 18 months, ordered that she enroll in the Maryland Professional Rehabilitation Program to address the Maryland Board's concerns regarding Dr. Kump's "pattern of deceptive behavior," imposed various terms and conditions to ensure compliance with the program, and further ordered that Dr. Kump be required to file a written petition for termination of her probation.

d. By Final Order dated June 17, 2016, the Florida Board of Medicine placed Dr. Kump's medical license on probation for a period to run concurrent with her probationary period in Maryland, and imposed terms and conditions to include an evaluation by the Florida Professionals Resource Network and compliance with all recommendations. Further, Dr. Kump was required to only practice under the indirect supervision of a board certified, licensed Florida physician.

3. Three months after the Maryland Board suspended her license on September 20, 2013, Dr. Kump resumed practicing medicine in Maryland without a license. She admitted to the Maryland investigator that she had purposefully signed patient notes with an illegible scribble because she knew that if she signed her name "that would be practicing medicine." Upon being questioned by the Maryland Board's investigator related to allegations of unlicensed practice, she attempted to conceal evidence and provided fraudulent answers. For example:

- Dr. Kump told the Maryland Board's investigator that she could not locate subpoenaed patient records. After witnessing Dr. Kump leaving a utility closet, the investigator located the full patient records, as well as multiple individual pages that were removed from the full records, hidden behind boxes in the utility closet. Dr. Kump later admitted

to removing individual specific pages from full medical records and hiding the individual pages in the utility closet because they showed that she had been the only provider to see the patients.

- Dr. Kump was observed removing her medical license and American Academy of Ophthalmology certificate from her office wall. When questioned, Dr. Kump stated that she had removed the items so the investigators would not photograph the documents.

4. Dr. Kump testified that she recognizes her past mistakes, and she made the misleading statements because she needed to stay employed. She asserted that she has paid fully for her errors, and has practiced in Maryland uneventfully since 2016. She further stated that she is seeking reinstatement of her Virginia license so she may be allowed to sit for specialty Board examinations and restore her professional reputation. Dr. Kump submitted professional recommendations in support of her application for reinstatement. Evidence also revealed that the Maryland Board fully reinstated Dr. Kump's license to practice medicine on November 8, 2018.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board concludes that:

1. Finding of Fact No. 2 constitutes a violation of Virginia Code § 54.1-2915(A)(5).
2. Finding of Fact No. 3 constitutes a violation of Virginia Code § 54.1-2915(A)(1), (13), and (16).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Virginia Board of Medicine, by affirmative vote of at least three-fourths of the members of the Board at the proceeding, effective upon entry of this Order, ORDERS that the license issued to Leila Kump, M.D., to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Virginia is REINSTATED.

Pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 2.2-4023 and 54.1-2400.2, the signed original of this Order shall remain in the custody of the Department of Health Professions as a public record, and shall be made available for public inspection and copying upon request.

FOR THE BOARD



Jennifer Deschenes, J.D., M.S.
Deputy Executive Director
Virginia Board of Medicine

ENTERED AND MAILED ON: 2/25/2022

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

As provided by Rule 2A:2 of the Supreme Court of Virginia, you have 30 days from the date you are served with this Order in which to appeal this decision by filing a Notice of Appeal with William L. Harp, M.D., Executive Director, Board of Medicine, 9960 Mayland Drive, Suite 300, Henrico, Virginia 23233. The service date shall be defined as the date you actually received this decision or the date it was mailed to you, whichever occurred first. In the event this decision is served upon you by mail, three days are added to that period.